



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,273	07/24/2003	Naga A. Ayachitula	SVL920030043US1	9607

7590 02/23/2006

Michael E. Hudzinski
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP
Seventh Floor
1100 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44110-2518

EXAMINER

VAUTROT, DENNIS L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,273	AYACHITULA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis L. Vautrot	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/24/2003
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 24 July 2003 has been received and entered into the record. Since the IDS complies with the provisions of MPEP § 609, the references cited therein have been considered by the examiner. See attached forms PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 7, 8, 21, 24 – 26, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Ignat et al.** (US 6,611,838).

4. Regarding claim 1, **Ignat et al.** discloses an abstraction layer for a database containing database records each including a plurality of fields stored in one or more tables, the fields being associated with the record by a key disposed in at least one key column of each of the one or more tables, the abstraction layer including: a key column identifier that identifies the at least one key column; and one or more metadata tables containing metadata relating to the database, the one or more metadata tables including

at least: a controls table containing control records corresponding to fields of the database, the control record for each field including at least a control key associating the control record with the field and at least one metadatum corresponding to the field. (See column 6, lines 31-34, 52-53, 60-66 and column 6, line 67 - column 7, lines 1-3)

"The metadata model is a tool to supply the common metadata administration tool, unified and centralized modeling environment, and application program interfaces for business intelligence tools... The data access layer contains metadata that describes how to retrieve physical data from data sources... The data access layer contains a part of the model objects that directly describe actual physical data in the data sources and their relationships. These model objects may be called data access model objects. The data access model objects may include, among other things, databases, catalogues, schemas, tables, files, columns, data access keys, indexes and data access joins... A data access key corresponds to a key in the data sources that references one or more column names whose composite value is distinct for all rows in a table.") The "metadata model" constitutes the claimed "abstraction layer". The "key column identifier" constitutes the claimed "data access key." The "data access layer" constitutes the "metadata tables" consisting of the "controls table," also mentioned in the claim.

5. Regarding claim 7, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses the one or more tables includes at least two tables, and the control record for each field further includes a table name that in combination with the control key associates the control record with the field

(See column 6, line 67 and column 7, lines 1-3 "Data access joins exist between tables. A data access key corresponds to a key in the data sources that references one or more column names whose composite value is distinct for all rows in a table.")

6. Regarding claim 8, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses a category table associating each of the at least two tables with one or more table characteristics. (See column 6, lines 52-53 and 63-66 "The data access layer contains metadata that describes how to retrieve physical data from data sources...The data access model objects may include among other things, databases, catalogues, schemas, tables, files, columns, data access keys, indexes and data access joins." The table characteristics are interpreted to be found in the data access model based on this description.)

7. Regarding claim 21, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses a method for accessing a database containing database records each including a plurality of fields stored in one or more tables, the method including: formulating a database access command using metadata related to the database contained in an abstraction layer, the metadata for each database field being accessible using an abstraction layer control record associated with the database field; and executing the formulated database access command to access the database. (See column 5, lines 27-30 and 65-67; column 6, lines 1 and 52-53; and column 14, lines 13-15 "The metadata model stores metadata about its underlying one or more data sources. It is used to provide a common set of business-oriented abstractions of the underlying data sources...The query engine is

responsible for taking the metadata model and a user's request for information and generating a query that can be executed against the underlying data sources, e.g., a relational database... The data access layer contains metadata that describes how to retrieve physical data from data sources... The query engine communicates with the data access component to obtain information that is required to let the data access component connect to the underlying data source.)

8. Regarding claim 24, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses the abstraction layer includes: a controls table containing the control records of the database fields, each control record including a field key; and at least one metadata table containing records corresponding to database fields and linked to the control record by the field key. (See column 6, line 63-67 and column 7, lines 1-3 "The data access model objects may include, among other things, databases, catalogues, schemas, tables, files, columns, data access keys, indexes and data access joins... A data access key corresponds to a key in the data sources that references one or more column names whose composite value is distinct for all rows in a table.") The schemas are equivalent to "control records" and the data access key is equivalent to the "field key".

9. Regarding claim 25, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses a controls table containing the control records of the database fields, each control record including at least one index metadatum; and at least one additional metadata table containing indexed metadata associable with database fields by the at least one index metadatum of the

control records. (See column 5, lines 27-30 "The metadata model stores metadata about its underlying one or more data sources. It is used to provide a common set of business-oriented abstractions of the underlying data sources." and See column 6, line 63-67 and column 7, lines 1-3 "The data access model objects may include, among other things, databases, catalogues, schemas, tables, files, columns, data access keys, indexes and data access joins...A data access key corresponds to a key in the data sources that references one or more column names whose composite value is distinct for all rows in a table.") The schemas are equivalent to "control records" and the data access key is equivalent to the "field key".

10. Regarding claim 26, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses executing a user application program, the formulating of a database access command being performed as an operation of the executing user application program. (See column 6, lines 13-15 and 19-22 "The use of the metadata model by the query engine is briefly described with reference to FIG. 3. A user uses a business intelligent tool or client application (not shown) to generate a user's request for information... Using the information that is built in the metadata model, the query engine makes the specification unambiguous and builds a query in terms of the data access layer for the specification.")

11. Regarding claim 27, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses an article of manufacture comprising one or more program storage media readable by a computer and embodying at least an abstraction layer for facilitating accessing a database containing

database records each including a plurality of fields stored in one or more tables, the abstraction layer including: a control table containing control records corresponding to database fields, each control record containing metadata associated with the corresponding database field (See column 14, lines 39-42 "The metadata exchange of the present invention may be implemented by any hardware, software or a combination of hardware and software having the above described functionality" and column 6, lines 52-52 "The data access layer contains metadata that describes how to retrieve physical data from data sources"), and at least one additional table containing additional metadata, each database field being selectively associated with one or more selected portions of the additional metadata through metadata contained in the control record corresponding to the database field. (See column 6, lines 60-66 "The data access layer contains part of the model objects that directly describe actual physical data in the data sources and their relationships. These model objects may be called data access model objects. The data access model objects may include, among other things, databases, catalogues, schemas, tables, files, columns, data access keys, indexes and data access joins.")

12. Regarding claim 28, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses formulating a database access command (See column 5, lines 65-67 and column 6, line 1 "The query engine is responsible for taking the metadata model and a user's request for information, and generating a query that can be executed against the underlining data sources, e.g., a relational database."); and during the formulating, accessing an abstraction layer to

identify at least one constraint on the database access command. (See column 6, lines 63-66 "The data access model objects may include, among other things, databases, catalogues, schemas, tables, files, columns, data access keys, indexes and data access joins." Here, the schema mentioned would likely contain constraints for the database access command.)

13. Regarding claim 30, **Ignat et al.** additionally discloses the article of manufacture further embodies a user application program executable by the computer, the executing user application program being operatively linked with the method for accessing the database. (See column 6, lines 13-15, 19-22, and 26-28 "The use of the metadata model by the query engine is briefly described with reference to FIG. 3. A user uses a business intelligent tool or client application (not shown) to generate a user's request for information... Using the information that is built in the metadata model, the query engine makes the specification unambiguous and builds a query in terms of the data access layer for the specification... A query in a data source specification language can be executed on the data sources. Thus, the correct data may be obtained.")

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Helgeson et al.** (US 6,643,652).

16. Regarding claim 2, **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a datatype index value indicative of a datatype of the corresponding field, and the one or more metadata tables further include: a datatypes table associating a plurality of datatype indices with datatypes. However, **Helgeson et al.** teaches the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a datatype index value indicative of a datatype of the corresponding field, and the one or more metadata tables further include: a datatypes table associating a plurality of datatype indices with datatypes. (See column 16, lines 23-25 "Attr_type Int Y The number corresponds to the data type of the attribute..." and column 17, lines 15-35 – see generally the chart where different datatypes are defined.) It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to use an index value for the datatypes in order to allow new datatypes to be added at any time by just adding another field in the table. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the at least one metadatum of at least one control record include a datatype index value indicative of a datatype of the corresponding field, and the one or more metadata tables further include: a datatypes table associating a plurality of datatype indices with datatypes.

17. Regarding claim 3, **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the datatypes of the datatypes table are selected from a group including: a character datatype, a numeric datatype, a text data type, a date data type, a time datatype, and a timestamp datatype. However, **Helgeson et al.** teaches the datatypes of the datatypes table are selected from a group including: a character datatype, a numeric datatype, a text data type, a date data type, a time datatype, and a timestamp datatype. (See column 22, lines 41-68, where datatypes for the object are assigned to the various fields). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include these various datatypes in the abstraction layer as they are some of the most commonly used. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the datatypes of the datatypes table selected from a group including: a character datatype, a numeric datatype, a text data type, a date data type, a time datatype, and a timestamp datatype.

18. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** in view of **Helgeson et al.** (US 6,643,652) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of **Subramaniam et al.** (US 6,782,383). **Ignat et al.** and **Helgeson et al.** teach an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** and **Helgeson et al.** fail to teach an operators table associating a database operation with a database type index value and with a corresponding display operator. However, **Subramaniam et al.** teaches an operators table associating a database operation with a database type

index value and with a corresponding display operator. (See column 21 lines 62-67 "In one embodiment, Search Term Separator control includes a picklist with the following options: "All words (AND match)", "Any word (OR match)," and "Exact Phrase". "All words (AND match)" option specifies a search to find records or documents containing every search keyword entered by the user." Here the database operators are "and", "or", and "Exact Phrase".) It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art that by including a table with the database operations, there could be different output based on the particular data type. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include an operators table associating a database operation with a database type index value and with a corresponding display operator.

19. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** in view of **Helgeson et al.** (US 6,643,652) and in view of **Subramaniam et al.** (US 6,782,383) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of **Williams et al.** (US 6,934,696). **Ignat et al.**, **Helgeson et al.** and **Subramaniam et al.** teach an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.**, **Helgeson et al.**, and **Subramaniam et al.** fail to teach the operators table further associates the database operation with a corresponding second display operator, and the operators table further includes: a language field associating a different language with each of the corresponding display operator and the corresponding second display operator, whereby the database operation has associated therewith display operators in at least two different languages. However, **Williams et al.** teaches the operators table further

associates the database operation with a corresponding second display operator, and the operators table further includes: a language field associating a different language with each of the corresponding display operator and the corresponding second display operator, whereby the database operation has associated therewith display operators in at least two different languages. (See column 26, lines 64-67 "The reason the system uses a text identifier is that it can define text in the database as a number while having the actual text stored in the string table in a language module. This is done for internationalization.") One with ordinary skill in the art would have combined the display operator table as mentioned earlier with an associated language field table in order to allow for different language versions with minimal overhead. Here, only a number or code would need to be passed, representing a string of text, rather than the actual string. The string that is displayed will depend on what language is set. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the operators table further associate the database operation with a corresponding second display operator, and the operators table further includes: a language field associating a different language with each of the corresponding display operator and the corresponding second display operator, whereby the database operation has associated therewith display operators in at least two different languages.

20. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of **Williams et al.** (US 6,934,696). **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat**

et al. fails to teach the datatype index value indicates that the corresponding field is numeric, and the at least one metadatum further includes: a sub-datatype index value indicative of a type of numeric value of the corresponding field, the sub-datatype index value being selected from a group including at least integer and floating-point numeric value types. **Williams et al.**, however, teaches the datatype index value indicates that the corresponding field is numeric, and the at least one metadatum further includes: a sub-datatype index value indicative of a type of numeric value of the corresponding field, the sub-datatype index value being selected from a group including at least integer and floating-point numeric value types. (See column 24, lines 31-42 "The f_value is the value-type of the Rule Step output if the value_type is float. The i_value is the value type of the Rule Step output, if the value_type is integer.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to add a field storing the datatype in order to appropriately use the data. By knowing the datatype, differing datatypes will not be erroneously combined. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the datatype index value indicates that the corresponding field is numeric, and the at least one metadatum further includes: a sub-datatype index value indicative of a type of numeric value of the corresponding field, the sub-datatype index value being selected from a group including at least integer and floating-point numeric value types.

21. Claims 9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Harper et al.** (US 5,717,925).

22. Regarding claim 9, **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a search flag indicative of an type of searching executable on the corresponding field. However, **Harper et al.** teaches the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a search flag indicative of an type of searching executable on the corresponding field. (See column 8, lines 47-48 "...a fuzzy search flag used for the Search function to specify fuzzy or nonfuzzy searching...") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a field indicating the search type in the layer as described above in order to facilitate data access and retrieval. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the at least one metadatum of at least one control record include a search flag indicative of an type of searching executable on the corresponding field.

23. Regarding claim 11, **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the search flag has a value indicating that the corresponding field is searchable by an SQL query, and the at least one metadatum further includes: at least one SQL query format indicator indicative of ala allowable SQL query format. However, **Harper et al.** teaches the search flag has a

Art Unit: 2167

value indicating that the corresponding field is searchable by an SQL query, and the at least one metadatum further includes: at least one SQL query format indicator indicative of an allowable SQL query format. (See column 3 lines 49-51 "The database catalog system manages the metadata store as a relational database and provides sort-query-logic (SQL) support for accessing the meta data objects therein..." and see column 5, lines 22-24 "The purpose of the Table object type is to describe the relevant properties of an SQL relational table or a client/server file.") By including a field indicative of the SQL query format and that SQL queries are allowed, the proper method to query will be used, allowing for efficient searching of the information. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the search flag with a value indicating that the corresponding field is searchable by an SQL query, and the at least one metadatum further includes: at least one SQL query format indicator indicative of an allowable SQL query format.

24. Regarding claim 12, **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach a case-sensitivity indicator that indicates whether searching on the corresponding field is case-sensitive. However, **Harper et al.** teaches a case-sensitivity indicator that indicates whether searching on the corresponding field is case-sensitive. (See column 8, lines 45-47 "...a case sensitivity flag used for the Search function to distinguish between upper and lower case property values...") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a case sensitivity flag as it is customary to allow the user to search with either

case sensitivity enabled or disabled. By including this field, the correct data can be found regardless of the case, if selected. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a case-sensitivity indicator that indicates whether searching on the corresponding field is case-sensitive.

25. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** in view of **Harper et al.** as applied to claim 9 above and further in view of **McElhiney (5,710,915)**. **Ignat et al.** and **Harper et al.** teach an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** and **Harper et al.** fail to teach the search flag has a value indicating that the corresponding field is searchable by a text search, and the at least one metadatum further includes: a text search field region identifier indicating a portion of the corresponding field that is searchable by the text search. However, **McElhiney** teaches the search flag has a value indicating that the corresponding field is searchable by a text search, and the at least one metadatum further includes: a text search field region identifier indicating a portion of the corresponding field that is searchable by the text search. (See column 5, lines 19-26 "Referring now to FIG. 2, after entry, block 202 designates a subset of the fields as non-searchable. As described above, ...the search table contains the fields which ay also be used for the selection criteria or aggregation functions.") One with ordinary skill in the art would have included a flag to indicate if a field is searchable in order to facilitate database operations more effectively. By including this field, time would not be wasted searching on a field that is not formatted properly to be searched. It is for this reason

that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the search flag having a value indicating that the corresponding field is searchable by a text search, and the at least one metadatum further includes: a text search field region identifier indicating a portion of the corresponding field that is searchable by the text search.

26. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Miura et al.** (US 6,629,091). **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a sort flag identifying whether sorting can be done on the corresponding field. **Miura et al.**, however, teaches the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a sort flag identifying whether sorting can be done on the corresponding field. (See column 7, lines 16-19 "...the sort item flag directs sorting or not of the field thereof according to the field value in the case of displaying the search result, and has the following meanings. 1: sorting –1: not sorting.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a field to identify whether a field is able to be sorted in order to ensure data integrity. If there was no sort allowed on the field, an attempted sort could corrupt the data. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the at least one metadatum of at least one control record include a sort flag identifying whether sorting can be done on the corresponding field.

27. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Hayashi et al.** (US 6,014,677).

Ignat et al. teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a display flag identifying whether the corresponding field is displayable. **Hayashi et al.**, however, teaches the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a display flag identifying whether the corresponding field is displayable. (See page 12, line 46-49 "The field information is constituted by an attribute name, an attribute value default, a display flag, an input flag or the line...The display flag assigns whether the field is displayed or not when the tag display is performed.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a display field flag with the abstraction layer because of the usefulness of being able to know if a field is in a displayable format or not. This keeps the output consistent and readable. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the at least one metadatum of at least one control record includes a display flag identifying whether the corresponding field is displayable.

28. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Williams et al.** (US 6,934,696).

Ignat et al. teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the one or more metadata tables further includes: a displayable table associating a plurality of display names with a field of the database through the control

Art Unit: 2167

key of the controls table, the plurality of display names each corresponding to a different language whereby the display name is multilingual. **Williams et al.**, however, teaches the one or more metadata tables further includes: a displayable table associating a plurality of display names with a field of the database through the control key of the controls table, the plurality of display names each corresponding to a different language whereby the display name is multilingual. (See column 27, lines 45-47 "The text_id is a number used to look up an actual text value in a string table in a separate language module. Text_ids are used to make internationalization easier.") One with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the benefit of having different versions of output based on languages for the ease in internationalization of the software. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the one or more metadata tables further include: a displayable table associating a plurality of display names with a field of the database through the control key of the controls table, the plurality of display names each corresponding to a different language whereby the display name is multilingual.

29. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Shah et al.** (US 6,041,325). **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach a syntax table associating syntactically valid inputs with a field of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field. **Shah et al.**, however, teaches a syntax table associating syntactically valid inputs with a field

of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field.

(See column 12, lines 55-59 and 62-63 "Once a service profile is defined, it can be uniquely identified and stored in database and accessed with display manager.

Customization available to a service operator or service provider for specific services include the ability to...further restrict valid input criteria...") One with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the advantage of checking the inputs for validity in order to keep the data consistent and in the proper format. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a syntax table associating syntactically valid inputs with a field of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field.

30. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** in view of **Shah et al.** (US 6,041,325) as applied to claim 16 above and further in view of **Subramaniam et al.** (US 6,782,383). **Ignat et al.** and **Shah et al.** teach an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** and **Shah et al.** fail to teach a picklist flag indicating whether the entries of the syntax table are displayable as selections of an input of a GUI dialog box. **Subramaniam et al.**, however, teaches a picklist flag indicating whether the entries of the syntax table are displayable as selections of an input of a GUI dialog box. (See column 21 lines 62-67 "In one embodiment, Search Term Separator control includes a picklist with the following options: "All words (AND match)", "Any word (OR match)," and "Exact Phrase". "All words (AND match)" option specifies a search to find records or

documents containing every search keyword entered by the user.”) Listing which selections are displayable allows the GUI to display only the proper options to the user, avoiding any errors related to the display. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a picklist flag indicating whether the entries of the syntax table are displayable as selections of an input of a GUI dialog box.

31. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Colbath et al.** (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0199495).

32. Regarding claim 18, **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach an aliases table associating alias names with fields of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field. **Colbath et al.**, however, teaches an aliases table associating alias names with fields of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field. (See page 3, paragraph [0044] “Alias table may include one record per proper name, where each record may include a named entity key and one or more alias fields.”) By including an alias field with the record, one with ordinary skill in the art would recognize the advantage of allowing multiple variations of words or names to be used to refer to the same field. By doing this, the database becomes more user-friendly and adaptable. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include an aliases table associating alias

names with fields of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field.

33. Regarding claim 19, **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the aliases table associates a plurality of alias names with at least one field of the database, each of the plurality of alias names having a language parameter associated therewith. **Colbath et al.**, however, teaches the aliases table associates a plurality of alias names with at least one field of the database, each of the plurality of alias names having a language parameter associated therewith. (See page 3, paragraph [0045] "Translingual table may include one record per proper name and/or coreference, where each record may include a named entity key and one or more translation fields.") By including the language parameter, one with ordinary skill in the art would recognize the advantage of being able to present the correct version of the word or name for the language chosen. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the aliases table associate a plurality of alias names with at least one field of the database, each of the plurality of alias names having a language parameter associated therewith.

34. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Dysart et al.** (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0139070). **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a

database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach a patterns table associating one or more search patterns with a field of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field. **Dysart et al.**, however, teaches a patterns table associating one or more search patterns with a field of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field. (See page 11, paragraph [0142] "Upon execution of a request, the second execution table will use the search patterns to attempt to match the data input to the parsing table(s), so that a match will identify the reference list field to which the data input corresponds.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art that by adding a table for search patterns, the abstract layer would be more advanced and could intelligently handle the input and properly correlate the input with a field. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a patterns table associating one or more search patterns with a field of the database through the control key of the control record corresponding to the field.

35. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of **Williams et al.** (US 6,934,696). **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the abstraction layer includes at least one translation table that includes equivalent text in a plurality of languages associated with at least one database field, the formulating of the database access command including: accessing the abstraction layer using a key that includes at least a field identifier and a language

selection to retrieve the equivalent text in the selected language. **Williams et al.**, however, teaches the abstraction layer includes at least one translation table that includes equivalent text in a plurality of languages associated with at least one database field, the formulating of the database access command including: accessing the abstraction layer using a key that includes at least a field identifier and a language selection to retrieve the equivalent text in the selected language. (See column 27, lines 45-47 "The text_id is a number used to look up an actual text value in a string table in a separate language module. Text_ids are used to make internationalization easier.") One with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the benefit of having different versions of output based on languages for the ease in internationalization of the software. Also, using the "text_id" as a key to retrieve the equivalent text in the selected language allows for easy modification of the database for additional languages. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the abstraction layer include at least one translation table that includes equivalent text in a plurality of languages associated with at least one database field, the formulating of the database access command including: accessing the abstraction layer using a key that includes at least a field identifier and a language selection to retrieve the equivalent text in the selected language.

36. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** in view of **Williams et al.** (US 6,934,696) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of **Subramaniam et al.** (US 6,782,383). **Ignat et al.** and **Williams et al.** teach an

abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** and **Williams et al.** fail to teach a database access operator, the equivalent text being a displayable name for the database access operator. However, **Subramaniam et al.** teaches a database access operator, the equivalent text being a displayable name for the database access operator. (See column 21 lines 62-67 "In one embodiment, Search Term Separator control includes a picklist with the following options: "All words (AND match)", "Any word (OR match)," and "Exact Phrase". "All words (AND match)" option specifies a search to find records or documents containing every search keyword entered by the user." Here the database operators are "and", "or", and "Exact Phrase".) Including the displayable names allows for uniformity of the information that is transmitted to the user. Here, some of the operators are provided, but this method allows for expansion as other operators are needed, making the system flexible. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a database access operator, the equivalent text being a displayable name for the database access operator.

37. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ignat et al.** as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of **Miura et al.** (US 6,629,091). **Ignat et al.** teaches an abstraction layer for a database substantially as claimed. **Ignat et al.** fails to teach the identified constraint on the database access command is selected from a group consisting of: a text string in a selected language that is incorporated into the database access command, a datatype constraint, a search

pattern, a search constraint, a sorting constraint, and a display constraint. **Miura et al.**, however, teaches the identified constraint on the database access command is selected from a group consisting of: a text string in a selected language that is incorporated into the database access command, a datatype constraint, a search pattern, a search constraint, a sorting constraint, and a display constraint. (See column 7, lines 16-19 "...the sort item flag directs sorting or not of the field thereof according to the field value in the case of displaying the search result, and has the following meanings. 1: sorting – 1: not sorting.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a field to identify whether a field is able to be sorted in order to ensure data integrity. If there was no sort allowed on the field, an attempted sort could corrupt the data. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the identified constraint on the database access command is selected from a group consisting of: a text string in a selected language that is incorporated into the database access command, a datatype constraint, a search pattern, a search constraint, a sorting constraint, and a display constraint.

Conclusion

38. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Donohoe et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0174196) – teaches using country codes for locale information.

Art Unit: 2167

Jusak (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0004654) – teaches coding search fields for the types of searches to be allowed.

Daniel et al. (US 4,965,772) – teaches multiple language display for fields.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L. Vautrot whose telephone number is 571-272-2184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere can be reached on 571-272-3780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dlv

Dennis L. Vautrot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167